DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 458 EA 026 051

AUTHOR Baker, Linda M.
TITLE The Politics of Collaboration: How an Educational Partnership Works.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Educational Cooperation; Interaction; *Intergroup Relations; Organizational Climate; Organizational Communication; *Partnerships in Education; *Politics of Education; *Power Structure; School Business Relationship; Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

This case study examined how representatives of one high-profile partnership worked to influence their associated school. Analysis drew from the "power-influence" perspective of educational policy analysis, a "microcosmic" approach that illuminates the political dynamics of an organizations by analyzing how people in organizations interact politically to produce particular outcomes. The case study was conducted in a major West Coast city in a small, innercity high school populated primarily by Asian and African-American students. It is the site of a 4-year, all-city magnet program aimed at attracting minority students into the teaching profession. The program has been supported since 1989 by four major parties: the primary industrial employer in the state; the College of Education of a respected state university; the largest urban school district in the state; and one of the major national computer manufacturers. Data were derived from: (1) meeting transcripts and field notes; (2) taped interviews with the four main partnership representatives, two founding teachers of the magnet program, and the school-district partnership administrator; (3) journal entries; and (4) document analysis. Findings indicate that this partnership influenced every aspect of its associated school program, and that this influence was manifested in three ways--in formal meetings, through pairs and small groups, and through brokers or linkers. Implications are that intensive community involvement in a school can lead to confusion about the "inside/outside" relationship; partnerships that exercise considerable influence in a school are working outside the normal hierarchy of district decision making; people who are skilled at bridging roles are critical partnership members; and a partnership's influence is related more to the dynamics of interpersonal interactions among pairs of people or small groups in informal settings than to large group interactions in formal meetings. Four tables and the data coding scheme are included. Contains 36 references. (LMI)

ED 375 458

The politics of collaboration: How an educational partnership works

by

Linda M. Baker
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. M. Baker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Prepared for AERA Annual Meeting
New Orleans, Louisiana
April 4-8, 1994

EA 026 051

My deepest thanks for guidance and comments from Drs. Pamela Grossman and Michael Knapp on qualitative research design and analysis, and Dr. Betty Malen on political analysis, theory and organizational approach. This paper is immeasurably better for their input. Thank you also to Dr. Stephen Kerr for giving me the opportunity to serve on the project which was the basis for this paper.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Educational partnerships have the potential to exert great influence on schools by providing them with sorely needed resources and expertise from outside institutions. However, because large-scale partnerships focused on facilitating educational change are relatively new, not much is yet known about **how** they wield any influence they might have, including little knowledge about how partnership representatives collaborate among themselves and with school staff to make things happen.

This case study examined how representatives of one high-profile partnership worked to influence their associated school. Analysis drew from the "power-influence" perspective of educational policy analysis, a "microcosmic" approach which illuminates the political dynamics of an organization by analyzing how people in organizations interact politically to produce particular outcomes.

Data analysis indicated that this particular partnership influenced every aspect of its associated school program, and that this influence was manifest in three distinct ways– in formal meetings which set the direction of the partnership; through pairs and small groups which accomplished much of the work of the partnership; and through brokers or linkers, those critical people who bridged between representatives of the partnership and other school staff.

The study has four major implications to be investigated further: (1) that intensive community involvement in a school can lead to a confusion of the "inside/outside" relationship where it is no longer clear what special authority or expertise school staff have or can exercise; (2) that partnerships which exercise considerable influence inside a school are working outside the normal hierarchy of district decision-making; (3) that people who are skilled at bridging or linking roles are critical members of partnerships, and (4) that the influence a partnership exerts is related more to the dynamics of interpersonal interactions among pairs of people or small groups in informal settings than to large group interactions in formal meetings.

Why study an educational partnership?

Educational partnerships are widely discussed in popular literature, and described and analyzed in professional literature. Politicians actively promote partnerships (among President Bush's "Thousand Points of Light"), and government agencies such as the U.S. Department of Education have entire grant programs established to initiate and sustain them. There is therefore a substantial interest in educational partnerships among the public, government agencies, and business and education professionals (Mann, 1987 a and b, Rist, 1990; Sirotnik, 1991).

While public schools have always received voluntary support from the communities they serve, in recent years the nature of that assistance has changed. Large-scale partnerships aimed at facilitating major educational reform are increasing dramatically, resulting in part from: (1) changing educational needs; (2) increasing strain on existing institutional resources available to meet those needs; and (3) a growing perception by a broad range of people that American schools face serious problems they cannot solve alone (see the partnership mission statements in Danzberger, 1990, Grobe, 1990 and King, 1986 for examples of typical rationales).

Collaborations between schools and other community organizations thus typically form so that institutions can work together to help realize what they think may not be possible for schools to attain alone. This follows a general sociological trend toward interorganizational collaboration to achieve common goals (Intriligator, 1986). It also witnesses to Baldridge and Deal's observation that the trend in education since the 1960s and 1970s is for pressure for change to arise from outside educational organizations in response to perceptions of decline, rather than from inside educational organizations in response to growth. (Baldridge & Deal, 1983).

In short, partnerships are currently of interest because they are popular educational arrangements, are growing in number, and are increasingly complex and ambitious with possibly far-reaching effects.

But partnerships are not universally perceived as desirable or effective. Because of their high hopes for collaboration, partners do not often consider the conflict that can arise when culturally disparate institutions try to work together to accomplish something. Instead, members often assume that common goals and good intentions will be enough to see a union through. Yet research in sociology, political science and educational policy science suggests that interorganizational collaboration may not be all that easy (Baker, 1994, Intrilgator, 1986; Pawley, 1992, Sirotnik, 1991).

Moreover, partnerships may pose challenges even when their members successfully circumvent institutional differences. Some critics feel the influence of outside agencies in schools can be overly directive or intrusive, suggesting that the needs of the school partners are too often outweighed by those of other parties with pressing agendas and more resources (Mann, 1987 a and b, Rist, 1990).

Other observers are concerned that, as newly influential forms of voluntary association, partnerships are not yet subject to the controls traditionally put on outside institutions or people trying to exert influence on schools, such as "school-oriented groups" [PTOs, national citizen associations and councils, and locally-based groups], and "interest groups" [ideological, racial minority, ethnic minority and feminist groups] (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand & Usdand, 1990, Rist, 1990).

These concerns about how much influence partnerships might be wielding on schools cannot be directly addressed because, while educational partnerships are widely discussed and promoted, there is not yet much empirical evidence about how they actually work or how much influence they can really exert.

And finally, knowing more about the internal dynamics of partnerships can help us better understand what goes right and wrong with them and why. It is likely that collaborations of all kinds will be prominent features of future educational environments. The needs partnerships have risen to serve are not likely to go away soon, and collaborative processes bring multiple points of view and an array of resources to bear on problems. Knowing as much as possible about how educational partnerships work can help us better design and manage future collaborations.

Why use a political framework to study partnerships?

Most existing analyses of partnerships in the business and education literature are either anecdotal– based on the personal experience of parties involved in single cases; descriptive– categorizing partnerships by characteristics across cases; or evaluative– focused on the final products or outcomes of partnerships (Cates, 1986, Chion-Kennedy, 1989, Danzberger, 1990; King, 1986, Grobe, 1990, Sirotnik, 1991). These kinds of analysis provide little empirical insight into the internal dynamics of interorganizational collaboration, and generally do not examine any wider implications of this new kind of outside involvement in schools.

In the fields of political science and educational policy analysis a number of researchers have investigated the dynamics of group decision-making processes, but so far only a few have systematically attempted to apply the resulting theories of interorganizational collaboration to educational partnerships (Intriligator, 1986, Pawley, 1992). And, as in the partnership descriptions, syntheses, and evaluations, these studies of the collaborative process touch only peripherally on the nature of influence exerted by partnerships. So if we wish to better understand how partnerships work to influence change, a new approach is needed.

There are many ways that any educational decision-making process can be analyzed. These 'frames' (Bolman & Deal, 1991), 'lenses', 'frames of reference', 'perspectives', or 'conceptual models' (Allison, 1971) each give different insights into how things occur and why.

> Conceptual models not only fix the mesh that the analyst drags through the material in order to explain a certain action; they also

> direct him to cast his nets in select ponds, at certain depths, in order to catch a fish he is after. (Allison, 1974, p. 4)

The frame chosen thus focuses the attention of the researcher on some phenomena rather than others ("in select ponds"), and encourages use of particular techniques ("at certain depths") and methods ("fix the mesh"). And, most importantly, the frame selected should depend on what kind of "fish" the researcher is trying to "catch". In short, it should be suitable to the nature of what is being examined.

The frame used most often in analyzing educational decision-making, the 'rational-actor', or 'rational' perspective, assumes that policy is the result of well-planned, rational activity by key people in positions of authority. They solicit and review relevant information and advice, and make careful choices among alternatives based on their relative advantages for agreed-upon goals. (Allison, 1974, Wise, 1983). The assumptions of this frame drive the expectations generally held for educational partnerships. They are expected to occasion rational judgments by seasoned, thoughtful and observant people, with authority to command resources, who work together toward a common end, consulting others as needed.

However, the 'rational' model has its limits. "To those who believe that reform of procedures will lead to reform of education, the rational model of schooling looks unquestionably correct...If only the schools are given clear objectives to achieve, then the objectives will surely be achieved. However, since such changes do not inevitably lead to the predicted result, perhaps there is something wrong with the rational model..." It does not "match the reality of schools... empirically explain the process of schooling...make reliable predictions...match teacher's conceptions of education...or devise rational management models that do not fail...". It also "simplifies reality... and assumes predictability in behavior" (Wise, 1983, pp. 103-106).

These criticisms of the rational model, coupled with the disappointment some observers have expressed in the outcomes of educational partnerships (Cates, 1986, Chion-Kennedy, 1989), suggest that a different frame might give better insights into these collaborative processes.

Another frame for understanding educational decision-making is 'political'. As described by Allison (1971), Baldridge (1971), Bolman & Deal (1991), Campbell and Mazzoni (1976), Lasswell (1936), and Morgan (1986), the political perspective views organizations as lively political arenas in which a variety of people actively pursue their diverse self-interests. Five assumptions underlie this frame: (1) "organizations are coalitions" composed of varied individuals and interest groups; (2) there are "enduring differences among individuals and groups" in what they perceive and value, and these differences "change slowly, if at all"; (3) important decisions in organizations involve the "allocation of scarce resources: they are decisions about who gets what"; (4) scarce resources and enduring differences make "conflict central to organizational dynamics, and power is the most important resource"; and (5) "organizational goals and decisions emerge

from bargaining, negotiation, and jockeying for position among members of different coalitions" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 186).

This description of organizational dynamics could well apply to educational partnerships. They are by definition coalitions of community groups ('partners'), which often exhibit clear cultural differences of perception and value (Baker, 1994, Intriligator, 1986, Pawley, 1992, Rist, 1990, Sirotnik, 1991). And they are usually formed to find and dispense sorely needed resources. It is likely then that they are also characterized by conflict and power-seeking, mediated by bargaining and negotiation. (Indeed, the term "collaboration" applied to this process of group decision-making implies these dynamics). Yet the literature to date largely ignores these political aspects of partnerships.

What might be gained by political analysis? First, partnerships which aim to change schools try to exert their influence in directions they think are important. Influence involves the use of power, and power to control outcomes is what politics is all about (Baldridge, 1971, Bolman & Deal, 1991, Morgan, 1986, Pfeffer, 1981). So the language, methods and purpose of political analysis can be helpful.

Second, political analysis attempts to see organizational dynamics realistically, accepting conflict as a normal part of human affairs present even in high-minded endeavors (Bolman & Deal, 1991). From this perspective conflict is to be understood and controlled, not condemned. Both the critics of partnership influence and those who are disillusioned by their results could learn something of value about these kinds of collaborations from a political analysis.

Third, political analysis is flexible, and can be done at macro and micro levels. An organization can be holistically examined at the institutional level relating to its external environment (political systems theory), dissected internally at the group level (political bargaining model), or analyzed minutely at the personal level (symbolic interactionism), or in some combination (Kanter, 1973, Malen, 1985). This wide range of approaches to examining partnerships politically means these kinds of research can add significantly to what is already known about collaborations. Political analysis is a well-established branch of educational policy research that has much to give to the understanding of any decision-making process which influences schools, including partnerships.

Theoretical framework--The "power-influence perspective" of political analysis

This study focused on the political dynamics of one high-profile partnership so the nature of its influence on its associated school could be critically examined. Its aim was to describe processes and raise issues that could contribute to a fuller understanding of partnership collaboration.

Consistent with the political perspective, and because educational partnerships have recently joined the ranks of the many parties which try to exert influence on schools, the guiding question for this research project was:

How do members of educational partnerships exert influence on schools?

As typical of micro-level political analyses, the wording of this question shows an emphasis on describing means of influence (how?) and a focus on the words and actions of particular people (partnership members) as evidenced in particular places (schools).

Related questions were:

How do members of educational partnerships exert influence on each other ?

and,

How do members of an educational partnerships exert influence on school staff?

These questions assume that partnership members interact politically both with each other and with school staff, and that the overall pattern of these interactions determines how the partnership influences the school.

The "power-influence" perspective on educational policy analysis was used to investigate these questions. This perspective represents an "inside/out" or micro-cosmic view which focuses on "actor interactions inside a process which leads to analysis of the political dynamics of an organization" (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976, p. 4). The "power-influence" perspective analyzes actors and their goals, resources, motivations and strategies within particular policy arenas, such as a partnership (See Malen, 1985, Pfeffer, 1981, and Wirt & Kirst, 1972 for examples).

In exploring how partnerships influence schools, then, this study described partnership members and school staff ("actors"), as they interacted in particular places ("settings"), examining their "goals", their "resources", how they were "motivated" and their "strategies" for achieving what they wanted. This vocabulary is characteristic of political analysis, drawing particularly from the work of Mazzoni (Mazzoni, 1982). [See Table 1 below and Appendix B for further descriptions of these categories].

In addition to these standard items the study also considered what school issues, activities and programs came up for discussion and action ("points of influence"). As the primary goals of the particular partnership studied were to influence curriculum, professional development of teachers, growth of a specific magnet program and use of educational technology, it was natural to begin looking for influence on policies and activities related to these four goals.

Table 1 begins on top of the next page

Table 1
Coding Scheme
General Definitions

Actors: Participants/players- individuals, groups, factions, alliances, established interests, ad hoc organizations
Setting: Institution and its broader environment, including the system you are in, and the conditions which surround and impact that system
Resources: assets, contacts, credits, capabilities - anything that can be used to affect decision calculations of other actors. Used to persuade, induce, constrain
Goals: aims sought, ends desired- stakes and stands, interests
Strategies: what actors do to convert their power resources into political influence and the skill with which they do it
Points of Influence: the subjects or topics at issue or the places in which influence can be seen

Resources Definitions

Authority- use of your official position, including command of other resources to which you have access by virtue of your authority
Funds/Money- liquid assets which can buy other resources
Expertise/information- use of technical information on the issue at hand or the intervention being planned
Status- use of knowledge of the histories of the players and/or rank according to what is valued in that system (age, gender, ethnicity)
Time- use of the amount of time an actor has to dedicate to an issue: full-time actors have more time to gather resources than part-time actors
Numbers/cohesion- use of the voting power of large numbers, or the size of your work force. Particularly potent if the group is cohesive and likely to respond alike.

Based on Malen, 1985 and Mazzoni, 1982

The "power/influence" perspective contrasts with the "political systems" approach to policy analysis, which evaluates an organization inside its environment, focusing on organizational inputs and outputs and systemic constraints (Edelman, 1976, Easton, 1965 a and b, Kanter, 1973). As example, this study does not consider the partnership as a subset of larger systems, such as the school district, community or society as a whole. Instead it focuses on partner interactions with each other and school staff within the school environment.

How was the study designed?
A case study of a partnership in support of an inner-city magnet program

This case study (Miles & Huberman, 1984, Yin, 1981) was conducted in a major West Coast city in a small, inner city high school populated primarily by minority students and recent immigrants, mostly Asians and African-Americans. It is the site of a four-year, all-city magnet program aimed at attracting minority students into teaching as a profession. According to its mission

statement the goal of the program is, "To prepare ethnically and culturally diverse students to be good teachers".

The program has been supported since 1989 by an educational partnership formed between four parties: the primary industrial employer in the state; the College of Education of the premiere state university, also a major national research univer-sity; the largest urban school district in the state (the school's home district); and one of the major national computer manufacturers. The federal government was also indirectly involved in the partnership from Fall, 1989 through Summer, 1993 through the U.S. Department of Education, which awarded the university a three-year grant of about $350,000 to use in support of one aspect of the magnet school program, involving teachers and students in computer-assisted instruction.

The high school is known as one of the more innovative in the district. It was the first to adopt site-based management, and the first to have an on-site student health clinic. Its administration welcomes community involvement, so the staff and students benefit from an array of social and educational services provided by outside agencies. And the former principal attracted a large number of grants to the school.

Moreover, the school is a warm and inviting place in which students are known by name and family, and the teachers regularly volunteer extra time to help compensate for deficiencies in their students' home and community life. As example, the final event of the schoolyear is the "Multi-Cultural Dinner", a visually-impressive, professionally-staged music and dance performance about their homelands and cultures performed entirely by students. It is accompanied by a meal of ethnic foods prepared in the high school kitchen by community volunteers. In many ways then, this would appear to be a 'best case' analysis– a look at a new program, in an innovative and caring school, amply supported by prestigious partners, attempting to address the special needs of kids often disenfranchised in the U.S. educational system (Yin, 1981).

Yet despite these advantages, the partnership has struggled to accomplish its goals. The computer vendor withdrew from the partnership altogether the first year; the corporate sponsor greatly cut back its financial commitment the second year; the school district did not fund the magnet program administrative position until half-way through the second year, and its repre-sentative stopped regularly attending partnership meetings; and the university chose not to apply for a follow-up grant for a fourth and fifth year.

This is therefore an interesting case for analysis because:

(a) the union was of sufficient duration that participants had time to develop a pattern of interactions with each other and could reflect on the ongoing collaborative process;

(b) the original promise of the partnership, represented by prestigious partners with abundant resources involved in an innovative school, had not been fully realized at the time of the study; yet

c) the remaining partners continued their commitment to the partnership and worked to keep some kind of relationship with the school even after the federal grant which provided most of the original resources expired.

Together these factors indicate that at the time of the study this partnership had signs of both dissolution and continuation. i.e., it was clearly struggling, so its internal dynamics and the complexity of establishing and maintaining a collaboration were visible.

This was also a case of convenience, as I had been involved with the project for two years as a representative of the university partner, first as a research assistant and then as the project coordinator. This was a participant-observation study in which I was a 'Full Participant' (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 40), for as project coordinator for the university grant, I was on the school site daily in intimate interaction with the whole range of school participants. This proximity to the case allowed for an intimate 'insiders' view of the processes described and more complete collection of data than is often possible. I was on-site four and sometimes five days a week for four to five hours per day, I was a participant in all important partnership meetings, and I knew and interacted with all the actors personally. This "participant-observation" of the site greatly facilitated my access to decision-making processes that are often closed to a researcher, such as impromptu conversations in hallways and informal discussions at lunch (Glesne & Peshkin, 1991).

However, my personal involvement could have also biased study results by influencing who and what was observed, what was said and done and how those actions were recorded and interpreted. As much as possible I have tried to minimize such bias by discussing my added role as researcher with partnership participants as the study began, including as many sources of information as possible in the study, comparing data across sources, recording my interactions with others as completely as I could, and reporting data as comprehensively as space and time allowed. I have also retained all the original materials so that others can inspect the raw data as they wish to answer their questions and draw their own conclusions (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, Miles & Huberman, 1984).

In all, I believe my involvement in the case garnered more advantages than disadvantages by giving me a deeper understanding of the import of some of the data than might have occurred to someone less familiar with the project and its people.

What were the data sources?
The people, activities and artifacts of the program

The partnership is routinely represented by five people, who together comprise the main political actors in the collaboration: the grant principal investigator from the university; myself, the university project coordinator; the education manager of the corporate partner; the high school's

magnet program director; and the principal of the high school. Occasional actors include school district administrators, outside educational consultants, high school staff and teachers.

These participants primarily meet altogether in one setting inside the high school– the monthly partnership meeting, so two meetings were observed and tape recorded, with additional field notes taken. In addition any materials handed out at the meetings were collected. All five routine actors were present at each meeting, as were several other occasional actors, such as the program administrative assistant and a teacher.

Analysis of the dialogue and human interactions at meetings yielded data primarily relevant to the first part of the research question– how partnership members exert influence on each other. Analysis was based on coding the taped and observed interactions to determine the resources each actor brought to bear on decision-making in that setting, their expressed goals, their apparent strategies for attaining their goals, and the points of influence of greatest interest to them. Analysis of the materials presented (such as agendas, reports and documents) gave additional insight into goals, resources, and points of influence.

However, meeting data yielded little information relevant to the second research question– how actors exert influence on school staff. Nor did meeting data shed light on the frequent actor interactions outside of meetings. For these reasons I conducted an hour and a half semi-structured interview with each of the other four main actors. These interviews focused on their interactions outside meetings, their institutional goals, their personal motivations and their perceptions of their means for influencing other partners and school staff. In order to get a staff perspective on influence from the partnership, I also interviewed one of the two remaining founding teachers of the magnet program. And last, to gain an experienced outside perspective on the general nature of partnerships in the wider school district, I interviewed the school district partnership administrator.

As participant-observer I also recorded my own observations and interactions in a journal every working day for a month, in which I noted who I interacted with, where, how and why. This data roughly corresponds to that supplied by the interviews of other actors.

The journal is additionally important because change studies which examine the process of introducing innovations often point to the central significance of "change agents", those whose job it is to influence people and institutions to change what they do or how they do it (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971). The journal chronicled my activities as a change agent in this project.

Last, I collected all documents given to me at the school during that month. I had a mailbox at the school and was given copies of all routine correspondence, including the daily bulletin, notices of meetings, notes from the principal and other administrators, agendas, event descriptions, minutes and solicitations. I selected from these materials all those which mentioned the partnership or its activities. I also kept all messages addressed to me personally.

To summarize, the study included four primary sources of data: meeting transcripts and field notes; taped interviews with field notes; journal entries; and a collection of documents.

How were the data analyzed?
The words, actions and artifacts of the partnership

The primary focus of this study was the interaction of partnership representatives and school staff as captured in their words, their actions and their artifacts. Interactions were sampled four ways, by interview, by observation in meetings, by collection of documents and by recorded exchanges with me. All four sources of information about interactions were analyzed using the same set of codes (see Appendix A).

Each interview, journal entry, meeting note or document was coded six times, once for each of the major categories. For example, the principal's statement that "Now I'm going to take over, I'm going to be the principal at _____ High School" (Interview, p. 13) was coded under Actor– school administrator (A/A); Setting– school (S/S); Resources– authority (R/A); and Points of Influence– Organizational Development (P/Od). This same phrase was examined for but not coded in the "Goals" and "Strategies" categories, because it did not contain information relevant to goals for the partnership and was not specific enough about strategies for "taking over" to code in that category.

Each appearance of one of the coded categories was tallied on the coding scheme sheet. In the case of interview responses and journal entries, these tallies formed a rough measure of each person's pattern of interactions and cluster of associations with others. This pattern of coded data was used to devise an "Influence Profile" for each of the primary actors in the partnership which indicates their unique pattern of interactions (see Table 2 below for example. Tallies are in parentheses).

Table 2
Personal Influence Profile
Program Director

Code	Pattern	Conclusions	Notes
Actor	(outside school) #1 corporate rep (83) #2 university rep (45) (inside school) #1 administrator (42) #2 teachers (56)	widest variety of others (mentors/community/ parents) kids (25) previous program directors (21)	more mention of teachers contacts inside & outside about the same- middle management

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Setting	school (56) corporate (13) university (5) mail/phone (7) community (9)	works mostly in school community settings are all one place- retreat location	
Resources	expertise (31) coordination (20) information (9)	uses mostly personal resources- expertise & coordination skills plus information about the project	
Goals	create community (28) new teaching (23) support kids (20) advocacy (11) personal development (11)	has more personal and emotional goals- related to her training as a counselor, community developer & teacher	sees supporting kids as common goal of all partners finds advocacy goal uncomfortable
Points of Influence	ambiance/climate (27) classroom practice (18) procedures (15) goals (12) staff (10)	outsiders influence through her	affects more esoteric goals like leadership, ambiance, community relations-- not concrete goals- calls them "qualitative"
Strategies	#1 Control Scope of Conflict (41): including documentation (23) and establish routines (15) #2 Coalition formation (40) including brokering (23) compromise (13) #3 Control Access	refers frequently to "building the community" by creating a "good climate" OR retreats to classroom to do things her way if not successful	bringing in the community & solidifying teacher support is her way to add to her power?

Both these individual influence profiles and an overall summary of interactions were used to address the two primary research questions. Data derived from meetings indicated more about how partnership members influence each other, while the journal entries and documents indicated more about how members influence the staff. The interview data provided information on both kinds of interactions.

While the data tallies indicated broad patterns of interaction, it is important not to treat the data as if it were quantitatively rigorous for several reasons:

a). counting the number of times a concept, person or action is referred to can only roughly indicate someone's priorities and the intensity of their interest in certain people, ideas or actions;

b). two coders could easily disagree about the intent of any given phrase or word and code differently. This study was coded by only one person and the codes therefore reflect my personal interpretations, conceptions and prejudices;

c). the meeting notes and journal entries are summaries rather than word-for-word transcriptions of each person's speech and actions.

In short, as in other qualitative studies, analysis of the vast amount of data accrued in the three months of this study was in the end an act of individual interpretation based on diverse sources of information. This act of interpretation was founded on the data but is greater than it, drawing also on my previous knowledge of the school, the people and the collaboration.

Key Findings

The data supplied information on a daunting number of aspects of the collaborative process, ranging from the strictly individual (who interacts with who, how often and where) to the institutional (why the school district encourages partnerships). I found the best way to elicit and present answers to the research questions from this sea of information was to describe the most striking patterns evidenced by the coded data and then discuss their implications. This section of the paper describes the data as it applies to each research question.

How do members of educational partnerships exert influence on each other ?

Not surprisingly, the primary setting for the partnership was the school. All the meetings were held at the school, many of the actors were in the school either daily or frequently and the school was the place where most of the work of the partnership was done. This emphasis on the school was most apparent in direct references to "the school", "the building" or particular places in the school, such as the computer lab, a classroom or an office. It was also more subtly apparent in actors' references to "inside" and "outside", and going "in" and "out", or in the case of the school district, "down" (The district administrative offices are in the city core, downtown). Frequent references were also made to "us" versus "them". All actors saw the school building and the people who were assigned to work in it as "inside" and "insiders", and other settings and the actors who worked primarily in those as "outside" and "outsiders". So this section deals with how the partnership representatives, the "outsiders", influenced each other.

In this partnership **the corporate representative held primary influence** among peers. As an individual he was referred to more often than any other single member, and his goals for the project were repeated as important goals by others, becoming symbolically represented in the first official mission statement and division of authority, which he authored.

His influence is apparent in that other members frequently asked him for resources (funding, information, expertise, equipment) and relied on his persuasive abilities, requesting that he intervene when they needed something hard to get. He was also strongly allied with the primary actor in the school setting, the principal, who referred to him 152 times in one 90 minute interview.

Moreover he had the widest array of resources available to him and was able to exercise influence in a range of settings, including the school, school district, community and informal

settings. He exercised influence directly in both formal meetings and informal discussions, letters and phone calls. He also worked indirectly through others, by encouraging members with primary influence in one setting, such as the principal, program director and university representative, to carry through on his suggestions.

Partnership members from the university were the second most frequently mentioned group of influential actors, particularly those who held the position of project coordinators (three separate people in the three year period of the grant). These actors were in the school setting every day interacting with school staff and this inside access gave them influence with the others. They were valued additionally for their resources, including individual expertise, their access to other partners and the monies from the federal grant which they administered, which were used to provide needed time, people, equipment, and expertise.

One type of actor was noteworthy for not appearing in interactions as often as the other primary members of the partnership– school district representatives. A school district representative only briefly attended one of the meetings observed, and did not appear in the journal entries or documents which noted interactions in the school setting. District members were referred to in the interviews but were cited largely for their role in the development of the partnership rather than for any ongoing influence. Their influence with others was based on providing institutional resources at the inception of the program. In the later years of the partnership district influence was exercised more indirectly through the principal, who often spoke of "going down to" or calling district offices to advocate for needed resources and get decisions.

The lack of active participation by the district as an actor may or may not mark this partnership as different from others. According to the district partnership coordinator, this urban district is involved with more than 200 partnerships of enough scope to be documented, of which about half are centrally coordinated through his office. The rest are handled on-site by administrators, usually principals, or teacher committees. It is not unusual then for this district to be uninvolved with the operational details of a particular partnership. However, the amount of publicity given to this partnership at its inception and the prestige of the founding partners suggested to other members that the district would be more involved than usual. When this did not happen, the others were disenchanted.

> ...the university, the corporation, the teachers, had more into the program than the school district. It was almost embarrasing to me because the district was my employer, and here they're the ones that came to us with the idea. (Interview, founding teacher, p. 10)

While the university principal investigator also did not appear often in the school setting, he did attend formal meetings and made some presentations in classrooms. Like the school district

representative, he exercised influence from his institutional setting through other people or by informal contacts. While the district member used the building principal and occasionally the corporate partner as go-between, the university principal investigator used the project coordinators. **Both also used communication,** primarily phone calls, notes and letters, **to bridge the gap between their settings and the school**. Their use of others who were in the school every day and informal means of contact allowed them to continue to exercise influence even though they usually worked outside the primary setting. For example, when asked how he would get something done inside the school, the university member said,

> I'd talk to you! (the project coordinator)...I have on various occasions talked to the principal, or the program director, or the program secretary.
> (Interview, principal investigator, p. 7)

Another **potentially influential set of actors was largely missing from interaction in this partnership– the community.** Only two actors, the program director and the principal, made reference to including community members in the activities of the partnership. The program director especially valued bringing community members into the program, particularly parents. She used them as resources– sources of information, expertise, people, and sometimes, funding. She referred to this as giving "support" to her position and the program. This community support gave her more influence with at least one other partnership member, the school district. For example, she and the program secretary successfully solicited parents and prominent community members to attend and testify at an important school district board meeting to secure continued funding for her position.

As suggested by the examples above, all the actors pointed to the **importance of regularly appearing in the primary setting where you can be seen and interacted with by others.** For example, several actors remarked negatively about the school district member's "disappearance" from formal partnership meetings.While the principal felt this non-attendance was due to multiple pressing demands for his attention, his absence was interpreted by others as signaling lack of commitment to the program. Similarly, other actors were scored for not returning phone calls, not responding to notes or letters or coming to the school infrequently. This suggests that "being there" may be as important for actors in collaborative efforts as what is done while "there". Presence signals commitment to the joint effort.

The descriptions above also suggest that **influence is directly related to control over resources.** All actors exercised some influence by controlling access to valued resources, although the kind of resources available to them varied. For example, the **single most frequently used resource in the partnership was information**. All the actors used information as a medium of exchange and influence with others, but the kind of information they used differed. Meeting data, document data and journal data all point to use of diverse information

resources (See section on influencing the staff for more information on diverse uses of information).

The **next most frequently mentioned resource was money**, particularly the federal grant administered by the university. But money was not by itself enough to give a particular actor influence. To be influential funds had to be directed toward goals other actors in the partnership found valuable. However, achieving any of these valued goals inevitably required marshalling time, people, equipment, facilities or expertise. As all these cost money, institutional monies, whether corporate donations, school district financial support or the federal grant, were critical to achieving partnership goals.

The importance of outside money meant that goals related to funding sometimes took precedence over other goals whether major actors wished them to or not. For example, the integration of computer-based technology into instruction was a major goal of the corporation and the entire focus of the university grant, but the teachers, principal and program director all saw use of classroom technology as peripheral to what they were trying to accomplish. This precipitated a struggle for influence between the second project coordinator and the principal, who wished to use grant monies for different purposes. This conflict almost resulted in the university leaving the partnership. The principal investigator forestalled this break only by allowing grant monies to be used more flexibly in the last year, thereby sharing decision-making over this major resource.

A final point to be made about resources is that having **an array of resources immediately available** gave an actor considerable influence over others. In this partnership the corporate member had the most resources he could quickly mobilize, including equipment to loan or donate, facilities to lend, people with expertise, vast numbers of employees, goodly amounts of institutional money and great status with important people in the school and district administration. While the university member could theoretically also command this range of resources he did so less directly, having to filter his requests through layers of authority above him, and ask for, rather than demand, support. The university member was also less inclined than the corporate partner to make use of his resources in pursuit of his own goals. Ironically, this reticence made his institution less influential.

> ...(the lack of curriculum) has been a continuing irritant to the corporation and I think a frustration to the university. Actually, those two adjectives are interesting 'cuz the corporation gets angry when they don't get what they want and, and whether it's the principal investigator's mannerism or the nature of a large institution, he just is, is very patient, but you know he would, he'd really like to have a few more outcomes from that grant. The corporate member (pounds table) will just fire them if they don't do it. (laughs)
>
> (Interview, principal, p. 26)

At the time of the study all the partnership participants agreed on the primary goal of the partnership– to attract a culturally diverse group of students to teaching careers. This goal was more frequently cited than any other. It was also institutionalized in many of the documents of the partnership, such as the "Mission Statement". Further, meeting notes and journal entries indicate that many project activities and events, and the program curriculum itself were all organized around this goal. It was one facet of the partnership on which everyone agreed.

This was not always the case, however. All the participant interviews indicated there had been a great deal of disagreement about goals in the past. In fact, this was **the area of the partnership which generated the most discord**, conflict and suspicion among partnership representatives. One participant felt these disagreements were the result of overly ambitious plans for the partnership (principal investigator), while others felt the original goals were insufficently outlined (corporate representative), conflicting (principal), or off-target (program director and principal).

There was also an arresting difference between how institutional representatives described their organizational goals and what others thought them to be. **Representatives were likely to describe their organizational goals in the formal terms of the contract or mission statement**. These were akin to the "official" role of the organization in promoting the partnership. They were "stated" goals. However, others in the partnership sometimes attributed different goals to them. These were "perceived" goals.

Perceived goals were often described less positively, as participants stereotypically "read into" others' motivations what they believed to be generally true of representatives of those kind of institutions. For example, the university principal investigator described the university's interest in recruiting more minority students to the teacher preparation program, a goal consistent with the primary mission of the partnership. The principal, however, believed the university instead to be primarily interested in attracting and retaining research money. Similarly the corporate representative described corporate interest in changing the character of schooling and the subsequent workforce by changing the nature of teaching and kind of teachers. This institutional goal was also consistent with the primary partnership goal. The founding teacher, however, felt the corporation was largely interested in positive public relations and in "controlling" schools. And district representatives stated their support for bringing more minorities into their teaching workforce by employing program graduates, an institutional goal clearly in support of the joint purpose. Yet at least two of the other participants felt the district was actually motivated by the desire to bring in outside resources to supplant or supplement district support. They felt the district would "promise anything" to get outsiders, particularly prestigious ones, into the schools.

These differences between stated and perceived goals closed through time. In part, participants overcame their initial institutional stereotypes as they worked together more as

individuals. In addition, institutional goals which conflicted or caused stress were brought into congruence with each other by protracted discussion of goals and responsibilities in numerous meetings and a retreat (Meeting notes, April 22), and several redraftings of the original mission statement. Increasingly each proposed project activity or program change was scrutinized for its consistency with stated goals (Meeting notes, March 3 and April 22). By the period directly observed those members whose organizational goals were still openly questioned were those who had not been present at ongoing discussions and modifications, such as district representatives.

Data on "points of influence" clearly indicate the great influence this partnership wielded on its associated program. **Partnership representatives discussed and tried to influence every single aspect ("point") of the program**, including setting goals and procedures, developing curriculum, selecting and training staff, recruiting students, determining resources, directing student activities and classroom experiences, and charting program growth and development.

While altogether the partnership exercised influence on all points of its associated program and some facets of the wider school, individual representatives differed in which aspects they were able to influence. With the exception of the project coordinator, **partnership representatives had the most influence over program resources, community relations, and organizational development**, with the corporate representative affecting more points of influence than the university representative. This difference resulted in part because the principal investigator sometimes deliberately limited his role in the school.

> I think if I had wanted to make sure that we used every last dollar of that (grant), I would have tried to take a more directive role in terms of going down there and saying to the teachers, 'OK, what are we going to do this year?'... And try to essentially formulate or formulate with them or get them to formulate a specific plan for, how do we use that money? But yes, I don't feel comfortable doing that for a number of reasons. For one thing, it seems to me that it is an intrusion on, really, the life of the school, or the life of the teachers.
>
> (Interview, principal investigator, p. 8)

Besides this personal decision on the part of one actor, partners did not formally question each other's intent to influence any aspect of the magnet program. Nor did they openly challenge attempts to include certain aspects of the program on agendas for action. Neither were there any written statements as to what forms of influence on what aspects of the program were justified. Instead, by the time of the study a consensus had developed that all aspects of the program were open for partnership discussion and action. Disagreements arose about goals and **how** to implement them, but there was **no public discussion on whether or not a suggested action was appropriate.**

The category where the mechanisms of partnership member influence on each other could have been most visible was "strategies", for to be coded as reflecting a strategy, statements had to clearly indicate that someone was deliberately acting on a plan for getting what they wanted from others. But **ascertaining the role strategies held in partnership interactions was difficult** for several reasons.

First, some "strategies" **coding categories overlapped** each other in ways that made it hard to decide how to categorize some statements or activities. For example, the program director chose to use a spreadsheet to report program demographics at meetings because it is a reporting format recognized as legitimate by the corporate and university representatives. Was this choice an example of "Controlling Scope of Conflict— privatizing by establishing procedures/ routines" or "Controlling Scope of Conflict— privatizing by documentation" or "Symbol Formation— words/ pictures"? It could be coded as any of these or several at once. This ambiguity lead to unreliable coding and bias, i.e., I had to read too much into responses from my knowledge of likely motivations for me to be comfortable about the coding. This problem occurred because the codes were originally devised from distinctions commonly made in the "power-influence" political perspective rather than derived from the responses themselves, and this far-ranging literature sometimes uses different terminology to refer to similar phenomena.

Second, **respondents felt uncomfortable about openly admitting to strategizing to wield influence**. They generally did not wish to perceive themselves as working deliberately to individually garner and exercise power, preferring to believe that their actions were in pursuit of group goals made after collective decision-making in the best interests of the students and school. The corporate partner, for example, who was described by several actors as deliberately and skillfully strategizing to wield influence, did not see himself that way at all, and would probably object to his actions being characterized as political rather than altruistic. An excerpt from his interview illustrates his perception of his role.

> **Question**: Can you say a little about how you personally work in the school? If you have something that you'd like to see happen here,how do you go about helping that to happen?
> **Answer**: Well, there isn't a lot that I do as far as something I'd like to see happen because I'm not an educator.
> (Interview, corporate representative, p. 12)

Yet despite this insistence that he does not make a priori decisions about what should happen in schools, earlier in the same interview he stated that his corporation was involved in schools in order to influence the nature of the future work-force, which they consciously went about by "developing a focus that says what we'd like to do" (p. 4), "putting together a program on strategic planning" (p. 4), teaching particular planning techniques such as "community scanning" (p. 4), running training sessions (p. 5), providing retired school administrators and executives to serve as

"team leaders" (p. 5), providing people, equipment or money to implement strategic plans (p. 6), and providing "education managers" to 44 school districts across the country who,

> work directly with the district to help them implement change... they have a responsibility because we monitor what they're doing. We have developed a focus, we have developed the procedures, we've developed the budget. See, we control the budget and so then we in turn train all those 50 people (education managers) on what we'd like to see happening. And then we monitor their activities to see...to make sure that everything they're doing fits into this focus.
>
> (Interview, corporate representative, p. 9)

In total the corporation has 25 different programs for outreach to schools, including grants for individual teachers and schools, paid summer internships at corporate headquarters, training and release time for corporate employees who wish to run for school board positions, and mentorships matching corporate executives with school administrators. (pp. 8-13). All are part of a deliberate effort to initiate school change.

Summary

Table 3 below summarizes the key findings of this section.

Table 3

How do members of educational partnerships exert influence on each other?

actors	corporate rep was primary actor– resources & willingness to use them university reps were second– daily contact in school & resources school district and community reps missing from most interactions
settings	the school is the primary setting– appearance there was critical those not in school daily worked through others & used communication & informal contacts to bridge the gap between their settings & the school
resources	influence was directly related to control over resources information was the most used resource, followed by money those with an array of resources quickly available had more influence
goals	reps agreed on goals only after much conflict & negotiation stated and perceived goals were different– perceived goals were based on stereotypes which lessened through time
points of influence	members tried to exert influence on every aspect of the program members did not openly question the appropriateness of their actions
strategies	assessing the role strategizing paid was difficult– overlapping categories & reluctance to admit to planned wielding of influence

Key Findings:
How do members of an educational partnerships exert influence on school staff?

The **classroom was the primary setting inside** the school. Teachers, the program director, the project coordinator and the principal all made frequent references to classrooms as the site of meetings and the ultimate setting for accomplishing the productive work of the partnership. Teachers had primary access to this setting, and the other actors, even the principal, were able to enter classrooms only after negotiating their access with a teacher. Most of the actors did not therefore regularly appear in this setting.

Yet knowing what occurred in classrooms was critical to advancing the goals of the partnership. **Information about classroom** activities, practices and actors (teachers and students) consequently **became a primary source of influence** in the partnership. Many of the routine reporting procedures of the partnership which took much of the formal meeting time were aimed at sharing information about classroom activities and events with partnership members. This passage of information from the classroom to the partnership was **facilitated by those people who were both partnership members and daily actors in the school**, primarily the program director and project coordinator, but also sometimes the program secretary and principal.

The nature of information use varied. Those actors identified as **"outsiders"** to the school, including representatives of the corporation, university and school district, **brought information from their settings to the school** in the form of research, technical expertise or other specialized knowledge. Indeed, one of their main functions in the partnership was to bring to the school the knowledge they had developed in other settings. For example, most of the actors brought into the partnership after its origination were solicited for their expertise, including several corporate representatives who taught organizational development and group process skills, a technology trainer, the program secretary and the replacement program directors and project coordinators.

In exchange, **"insiders" gave back information about the specific activities and events of the program**, its students and teachers. Significant pieces of the formal meetings and some of the informal interactions were centered around generating and reporting information about the magnet program. This information was formally manifest in a series of **reports from school actors to "the partners"**. The format of these reports was largely quantitative, including student demographic listings, budget balance sheets, and accountings of student coursework, gradepoints, tutoring hours and tuition monies earned (the corporate partner contributed money toward each student's college education based on their GPA, course completion and time spent tutoring). The time and expertise required to generate this particular information in particular

formats sometimes caused resentment among school staff, who would have preferred to spend their time in other ways, including generating different kinds of information.

> I keep feeding them ("the partners") the positive things teachers are doing and the program's doing so I try to have that in the little report in the partner meetings and all that. I don't know if that matters to them by the way. To me, these are the qualitative measures of how we're doing...I usually hand it out, and I've tried to go over it when I see some interest...I think they probably need more quantitative stuff... numbers, numbers of minority kids, numbers of this and that.
>
> (Interview, program director, pp. 19-20.)

In short, information exchange from the school to "the partners" was largely reporting on program particulars by "insiders" to "outsiders" in formats that were comfortable and familiar to them. **School actors were far less likely to provide information based on their own expertise and experience**. One of the assumptions of the partnership was that outsiders were supporting the program because school insiders lacked the needed expertise, including technical expertise, curriculum writing expertise and knowledge of preferred educational practice. This assumption undermined the desire of inside actors such as teachers to use their own information resources to influence outside actors. The few exceptions to this pattern occurred when one of the outside actors credited their experience in the school with giving them new insights.

> You know there's many times when she (the principal) would reject my ideas because she said 'That isn't going to work in this school'. She said, 'It may work at your corporation but it probably won't work in the school and here's how I want to do it'... and we'd discuss that...I've learned, especially working with this high school, what one would call multi-cultural diversity, and have changed some of the ways I would handle different situations at work by finding out or learning how they do it at the school. And I think that's just one example of one of them where schools can help the business world, and the business world can help on the management processes.
>
> (Interview, corporate representative, pp. 13-14)

Together the observations above suggest that **controlling how much and what kind of information gets generated, by whom, for whom, and for what purpose, is a major source of influence in an educational collaboration.**

The quote above also indicates that nuturance and human relations skills may be valuable kinds of knowledge that could flow from school actors to others, but often did not. For example, the program director pointed to her knowledge about how to help people of disparate backgrounds and needs "build a community" by creating a "positive climate" as her primary resource in making the magnet program effective. Yet she felt this skill was undervalued by others in the partnership.

> They ("the partners") probably think that what what I'm doing... I'm building positive climate-- to be so low on the totem pole as to be probably not important. And yet that's what I spend a lot of my time on. (Interview, program director, p. 17)

As a group teachers were cited more often than any other members as important actors as they were responsible for carrying out the project in the classroom setting. **Changing teacher activities and practices was therefore a primary goal of the partnership**. As incentive to this change they were given increased resources (money, time, equipment, training). Their primary resource in exchange was their numbers. If they wanted to influence what the partnership was doing, they rallied other teachers to support their position or made reference to the collective needs of their students. They also used information on what was happening in the classroom and school settings.

However, as individuals the two teachers interviewed (a founding teacher and the program director, who teaches half time) **felt gradually disenfranchised as the project developed**. In the beginning of the partnership individual teachers had influence on project goals, points of influence and resources, and were actively involved in strategizing to advance program goals. Through time, however, they felt influence passed to others, either "the partnership", the principal or a new bloc of teachers. Their concern at the time of the study was to get the program's teachers actively involved in decision-making again.

Interestingly, the **money from the grant**, while substantially higher than what the corporate partner was contributing, **did not give university members as much influence** with the staff as the corporate member had, even though he was not in the school everyday as some of them were. This may be because school staff did not perceive the grant monies as supporting their primary goals. The grant was focused on encouraging the use of computer-based instruction in the high school, a purpose which was perceived by staff as tangential to the project's overarching goal– "To prepare ethnically and culturally diverse students to be good teachers".

> Now the district and the corporation were very much aligned in what they thought the program is. It was the university and the project coordinator and the principal investigator who seemed to have a different picture which may or may not include minority students. It was more around technology and uh, developing curriculum relative to technology. (Interview, high school principal, p. 19)

The founding teacher and program director shared this perception, although the university representatives did not. They felt committed to the program goals for minority students.

This example suggests that money alone is not necessarily enough to give an actor influence. Instead, to **wield the most influence money must be applied in directions thought valuable by other actors**. (This is referred to in the "power-influence" literature as the "Status" resource– your standing with others is based in part on how much they value what you have to offer).

The overall importance of resources to the partnership is most apparent in the effectiveness of threats to withdraw them. All the major partners threatened to withdraw from the partnership at one point or another, and one original partner, the computer vendor, did leave at the end of the first year. As a result all the "inside" actors made reference to doing things to try to keep the "outside" actors from leaving and taking their resources with them. They were concerned they could not have a viable program without outside assistance, at least not so early in its development.

> The corporate partner asked me to have lunch at the corporation, and that lunch was with him and his superior. And it was at that point that I was basically told that they were going to pull out of the magnet program. And the reason they were going to pull out was that it had not accomplished what it was supposed to do. And I said... 'Well, why don't you give me a chance? I mean, let me go in and find out what's happening...' And I shared that the project coordinator, the university, seemed frustrated with the magnet program, sure they were frustrated with the program and maybe it was something that could be fixed. (Interview, principal, pp. 8-9)

This quote indicates school staff were cognizant of what the partners wanted and anxious to retain partnership support.

The principal acted on her desire to improve program performance in the eyes of the partners by **recruiting a fresh group of teachers chosen for congruence** with partnership goals in their teaching styles and beliefs. Their participation was encouraged by reference to the increased resources available to them and by appeal to their individual desires for professional and personal growth. This **appeal to individual and professional goals was a common recruiting mechanism** used by both insider and outsider actors.

Of those interviewed and observed, only the university principal investigator had been involved in the original instigation of the project. All the others had either been assigned to the partnership by their organizations or recruited by instigating members. In either case, each had to find reasons for agreeing to join the group. In most cases, they agreed because they wanted a new challenge and saw the partnership as the means. They felt they had the skills needed or wanted to develop new ones.

> Last year the principal said that we needed someone in a lead role. Not just to administer the program but who actually worked with the teachers to improve instruction so we could finally look at, "How do you teach?"...So, we needed somebody to do that, and when she talked to me about it, she...I thought, "Oh, that sounds right up my alley..." (Interview, program director, p. 2)

However several found themselves assigned to the partnership for reasons they did not initially accept, feeling outside pressure to belong.

> I was approached by the former principal, about sitting in on a district presentation on having a magnet in the building, and it was sort of presented to me that if we didn't have the magnet, then our enrollment would be down and...it was almost like we should have it here and they're telling us we're going to have it here kind of deal. (Interview, Founding Teacher, p. 1)

In the subsequent part of the interview, however, this same teacher began to call the magnet program "ours" and enthusiastically described how she and other teachers traveled to distant sites to gather information, participated in designing the program, drafted grant documents, solicited outside partners, lobbied for the support of other staff members, and recruited and interviewed the initial group of students. It was evident she enjoyed and learned from the range of professional activities associated with being part of the partnership even though she'd had initial reservations about it. Thus suggests **opportunities for growth and responsibility are a major incentive for those in the school to join and work with a partnership.**

In general, **school insiders carried through the work of the partnership by exercising their influence with people and activities inside the school rooms and building.** The program director, for example, felt she had the most influence over the style of the magnet program, which she exercised by promoting certain kinds of activities, events, and procedures. The founding teacher felt most in control over the program's development through establishment of its initial curriculum, goals, procedures and resources. And the principal thought control over staffing and management of personnel were her primary means of influence.

Through time the sphere of influence of the partnership spread from the program to the wider school as some partnership-sponsored activities, events and opportunities were made available to those in the high school who were not formally affiliated with the magnet program. For example, in its final year federal grant monies set aside for innovative use of technology could be applied for by any teacher with a good plan for using them, and technology and curriculum development training were open to all interested staff.

This growth in the partnership's sphere of influence occurred for three reasons. First, the corporate partner had at first been a partner to the school as a whole as part of a district-wide PIPE

(Partners in Public Education) project, and so actively encouraged the involvement of the entire school. Second, teachers, staff and students involved in the magnet program were also leaders in the school whose influence was accepted and whose ideas were respected. They could therefore use their status in the school as a whole to share ideas, events, and innovations tested in the program with their colleagues in the school. And last, there was initially some resentment of the substantial outside resources brought to the program among those on the staff who did not share in them. The principal felt these resentments were sufficiently divisive to require active overtures to the staff as a whole lest the magnet program be crippled by a perception of elitism.

Because of the limitations of the strategy categorizations discussed earlier, only two major generalizations about partnership strategies to influence school staff can be made. First, **those with authority positions or access to resources** (the principal, program director, district and corporate representatives) were more likely than others to use **control over access/ communication, agenda-setting and pressure** as strategies. The program director, for example, wrote and distributed the agenda for partnership meetings, determining who besides regular participants would be invited to attend. Similarly, the principal decided which teachers could be part of magnet program activities, excluding others (including the founding teacher) from subsequent meetings and activities. And the corporate representative had a major hand in setting the program's overall agenda by co-writing the mission statement which settled its structure and goals.

In addition, the principal, the corporate representative and the university principal investigator occasionally used pressure, including threats and charged emotions (anger), to ensure compliance with partnership goals, while the program director used positive emotions (personal satisfaction, feelings of community, program "ambiance" or "style") to encourage involvement.

Those without authority were more likely to use coalition formation, control over the scope of the conflict and symbol formation as influence strategies. For example, teachers often made reference to the collective needs of "their students", and the project coordinator frequently mentioned conversations with particular teachers and their committees. In both cases participants were using the power of numbers to lend force to their arguments, a claim buttressed by previous or subsequent visiting with mentioned individuals to ensure their support (coalition formation).

The program secretary spent time controlling the scope of the conflict and forming symbols by establishing program routines and procedures, assigning work to student helpers and educational interns, and documenting program activities, events and demographics. As mentioned earlier, the words and images of her spreadsheet, for example, were used to diffuse pointed questions into accomplishment of project demographic goals by presenting information in a form reassuringly familiar to the corporate and university representatives. (Interview, program director, p. 8)

And the founding teacher, finding herself excluded from program activitites in the last year of the partnership, retreated to her classroom, asking students to tell her what was going on (Seeking information— informal questioning), and occasionally brokering between competing groups (disaffected students and the program director, disaffected teachers and the principal).

Overall, there was a difference in influence strategies used by participants depending on how much power they wielded through authority or access to resources.

Table 4 summarizes the key findings of this section.

Table 4

How do members of educational partnerships exert influence on school staff?

actors	teachers– were the targets of change efforts due to their connection to the classroom, but as a group had less influence through time influence passed from 'partners' to staff through intermediaries- those actors who were intimate with both insiders and outsiders
settings	the classroom was the primary setting– information about classroom activities was critical for influence teachers control access to the primary school setting
resources	information was the most important resource– manifest in a series of reports from staff to 'partners' on class activities, students, program events and use of resources money most influential if spent in directions valued by school staff threats to withdraw resources worked to advance partner goals
goals	program staff were recruited for their congruence with partnership goals opportunities for growth and responsibility (individual goals) helped attract staff to the work of the partnership
points of influence	through time partnership influence spread outside the associated program to include more of the school insiders most influenced other insiders and classroom activities
strategies	those with authority and/or resources used access/communication, agenda-setting & pressure as strategies those without authority and/or resources used coalition formation, symbol formation and control of the scope of the conflict as strategies

General Analysis and Implications

There are certain commonalities in the data description as presented so far which make analysis of such a large amount of information across an array of categories easier to grasp. Three aspects of the way partnership members influenced each other and the school stand out— the special role served by linkers or brokers, the significance of informal, interpersonal contacts between actors in pairs and small groups, and the confusion of "inside/outside" relations.

Linkers or Brokers

Partnership **influence flowed in interesting ways through particular people who by virtue of their job assignments bridged the gap between partnership participants and the school.** The program director, project coordinators and, to a lesser degree, school principal all served this linking or brokering role. By virtue of their pivotal positions between inside and outside school actors, they were present in multiple settings, both formal (meetings) and informal (pairs and small groups), they had access to all actors inside and outside the school building, they could directly command or request most of the resources available through the partnership, and they had influence over a broad array of partnership activities, events and procedures (Acting much as Rogers & Shoemaker's "change agents", 1971).

The project coordinators, for example, had some influence on every point noted except student recruitment. This may be because while the coordinators represented an outside agency (the university), they also worked at the site (school) with school staff on an intimate, daily basis. They were thus outsiders who behaved like insiders, and so through time came to have a great range of influence.

Linking or bridging positions of this kind are necessary features of collaborations in which most of the active participants have their primary affiliation with another institution to which they devote most of their time and attention. As the few participants whose jobs relate primarily to the partnership, it falls to those in the linking positions to make sure that partnership decisions are clearly communicated to those who must carry through on them and that school staff needs, desires and problems are communicated back to the partners.

The **dynamics of these brokering positions help set the tone** of the partnership. How much, how often, how carefully and with what attitude people serving linking roles communicate with other participants shapes the perceptions of both those in the school and those in the partnership, who usually do not interact directly with each other as much as indirectly through the linkers/brokers.

These **linking positions are therefore critical to the success** of partnerships and can subsequently be exciting and interesting jobs right "in the thick of things". However, the delicate nature of balancing the sometimes competing demands, agendas and world views of various individuals from different organizational cultures can make linking/brokering roles stressful. The program director likened her role to those of "middle managers" in business hierarchies, who receive directives from above them to meet performance demands, but can encounter problems or resistance below them when they attempt to carry through. As a result she felt a lot of pressure and anxiety (Interview, program director, p. 11). The school principal felt similarly on occasion, as did I as project coordinator. It was difficult for me to keep up with the practical day-to-day demands

of project life in the school and also maintain the professional, technical and theoretical knowledge expected of me in my university life.

Because these linking roles are critical to collaborations, it would be **helpful to know more about the personal and professional characteristics of the people who hold them.** As community organizations increasingly collaborate with educational institutions to accomplish common goals there are likely to be increasing numbers of positions of these kinds. In addition to school/business/university partnerships, there are also social service and governmental organizations involved in schools. They are beginning to place staff directly in those school buildings where students are particularly needful of their services. The high school in this study, for example, had a staff person employed full-time by the city to provide city services to the school, two full-time health workers employed by the in-school health clinic, and several part-time social service and counseling workers with offices in the building. Knowing more about how all of these linking/brokering roles operate, and what personal qualities and environmental conditions are required to support them, could assist the people involved in these positions to be more effective.

Pairs and small groups

A second striking feature of the partnership was the amount and kind of activities which occured in informal, small group settings such as restaurants, school hallways, the lunchroom or offices. **All the actors referred to significant interactions they'd had with one, or sometimes two other actors in informal settings away from the others** (These nformal relationships functioned much as those described in Morgan, 1986).

The **dynamic of these informal settings was often distinctly different** from the dynamic of more formal settings such as meetings. In particular small group or one-to-one interpersonal contacts were more likely to be characterized by an exchange of information specific to one kind of actor or one setting, such as the "teachers' point of view" or the "administration's point of view". These exchanges were frequently characterized as "private" and were often not intended to be shared completely with other actors. Instead they served to distribute information among those who would have to work together or act in concert, helping them develop commonalities and solidify support for communal actions. Essentially this different dynamic mirrors that of other forms of "private" communications as opposed to "public" ones.

Probably because they were usually private, **informal exchanges were also more likely to be marked by highly charged emotions, more use of authority, more bartering , and sometimes, threats.** It was largely in one-to-one interactions in private offices, luncheons, classrooms or telephone calls where jobs were jeopardized, threats made to withdraw, and authority exercised. These interactions were consequently more likely to involve negative emotions and actions such as yelling, tears, fears and complaints. In contrast, **formal interactions at meetings and in documents were mostly characterized by polite**

interchanges and exchange of resources. Where conflict arose in these public settings, actors were more likely to either negotiate for consensus and mutual reward or postpone action or decision-making. (The latter action often put the issue into private settings for resolution).

Actors who worked primarily outside the school, including the corporate member and his staff, the school district member and district staff, and the university principal investigator, often met informally with other actors one-on-one or in a small group over lunch, in casual contacts at professional groups or community meetings, or in their own offices.

Actors who worked primarily in the school, including the teachers, school staff and students, interacted informally in twos or threes in hallways, the lunchroom, the staff lounge, school offices and classrooms.

Actors who worked both inside and outside the school, including the principal, program director and project coordinators, appeared in most of the informal arenas. In fact, **appearing in multiple settings was apparently an expected part of these kind of jobs,** as making connections with other actors in their own settings was an integral part of their effectiveness. The program director referred to this as "management by walking around"...

> ...as much as I hear from the partners I will pass on to them (teachers and students), and as much as I could hear what they needed or felt I tried to represent (to the partners) . So it doesn't mean just representing me, but more truly representing them. A lot of managers, by walking around, and a lot of times, as you do too... you hardly sit down. (referring to me, the project coordinator). Oh sure, sometimes you notify people in the meetings, but I would really rather go down to Teacher X's room when I hear he's upset...you know, I need to work that out with him right on the spot. (Interview, Program Director, p. 10)

Much of the work of the partnership was done through these kind of interpersonal contacts between small numbers of people in informal settings. Restaurants, lunchrooms, hallways, private offices, classrooms and lounges were the sites where the directions set and decisions made in formal partnership meetings were implemented or not, as actors interacted personally with each other to push the program forward.

As suggested earlier, the dynamics of these small group encounters, usually pairs or trios, differed markedly from the more formal, ritualized and polite interactions of partnership meetings, in which the medium of exchange was mostly information and conflict was seldom overt. In contrast, pairs and small groups were characterized by more spontaneous, freeform communications (no agendas) exhibiting a wide range of emotions. It was in these where bargains were struck, politicking done, authority exercised, and pressure openly exerted.

As a consequence participants held strong feelings about these kind of interactions. They often **spoke of their personal contact with each other as the most involving, revealing,**

fruitful, satisfying and productive part of being part of a collaboration. But it was also in these relationships that people were the most hurt, hostile, challenging, reactive and demanding.

In essence it is in one-to-one or one-to-several relationships that the real character of the collaboration was formed. Yet ironically, because they are spontaneous and occur outside formal public settings, it is just **these kind of relationships which are the most difficult for a researcher to observe and record.** Observations on these informal, interpersonal interactions came from the journal recording my contact one-on-one with others, and by interview reports of past encounters by those who participated in them. Both kinds of observations are filtered through personal bias— participants naturally prefer to cast themselves in a good light and put any blame on others. As a participant-observer in daily interaction in pairs and small groups, I was able to directly observe some spontaneous, unguarded interactions, but these were not always measured by the instruments I chose to use (interviews, journal entries, meeting notes and documents). And of course even these observations were filtered through my knowledge and perceptions of the individuals.

This study suggests that the **interpersonal dynamics of informal groupings in which participants work together to further group goals are critical to the success of any collaboration** and should be: (1) attended to carefully when participating in collaborations; and (2) studied further in whatever way is possible.

Confusion of "Inside/Outside" relations

By virtue of the resources they bring to collaboration and their intimate presence in key settings, some actors who were identified initially as outsiders to the working school community gradually gained the privileges of insiders, including access to and influence on key decision-making processes. In the partnership described here corporate and university representatives wielded great power over perogatives normally reserved to experienced K-12 educators, such as goal-setting, budgeting, personnel selection, and curriculum and program development. Moreover, this influence was often exercised in private, informal settings outside the normal hierarchy for school decision-making, with few institutional limits placed on partnership actions.

This resulted in a confusion of the usual "inside/outside" relationship. By virtue of their professional training and experience, school faculty and staff traditionally exercise primary influence over critical aspects of their institution (staffing, curriculum, goals, procedures and scheduling) and workplace (classroom practice, student activities, recruiting, ambiance, leadership style). Yet in this partnership, where insiders were deeply engaged with and partly dependent on outsiders, some of whom worked daily side-by-side with them over long periods of time, the **traditional division of responsibilities broke down**, involving outsiders in what used to

be largely insider activities, such as selection of staff, setting of institutional goals and procedures, and development of curriculum. This intermixing blurred traditional lines of authority and responsibility.

All the insiders in this partnership made reference to and had some reservations about this blurring, and the principal found it deeply troubling.

> I have some real concerns about partnerships that get involved in the actual goals and outcomes of education. This has been an interesting learning experience. And it has to do with ethics and politics in education. What if there was a partner, a very powerful partner, that wanted to do something that you DIDN'T think was right? ...in this case goals are accepted by most, but Company A IS in fact moving a school along those lines faster than you might see in a normal high school or magnet program with ordinary kids...
>
> (Interview, principal, P. 26)

She speculated about hypothetical cases to further illustrate her point.

> What if you had a company like Company B (a leading computer software publisher) that had a vested interest in um, a more highly computerized, or technology, uh, driven curriculum, that without testing, without really looking at the outcome, you could be right down the path toward an, an educational system that was completely different. So, I have some real concerns about partners, now that I've gotten dropped in, brand new principal, and, and sat at these tables with this kind, this kind of dynamics. Uh...decisions are made that um, are quite beyond the scope of the regular superintendant, assistant superintendant and then down to the principal.
>
> (Interview, Principal, pp. 26 & 27)

In noting this last, that partnership **decision-making often occurs outside normal lines of hierarchical authority and accountability**, the principal makes an important observation which merits investigation in other partnerships. Yet she later suggested that in its range of influence the partnership studied was not typical of others she had been involved with, where school faculty and staff initiated and developed the project with outside concurrence rather than direction.

Based on his experience with a large number of partnerships, the school district partnership coordinator corroborated the principal's contention that **many partnerships are far more limited in their range of influence than the one studied here**. Yet he did not share her concerns about those which are broad-ranging, provided their representatives have the necessary expertise.

> I cannot imagine a part of school operations that the community should not be involved in. I mean, by God, the schools belong to the public...But I have to put a caveat out on that. As long as they are

> trained...you can't come in and say, "I want to revise the curriculum," when you don't know anything about learning styles or that kind of stuff...developmental processes...
> (Interview, district partnership coordinator, p. 11)

He outlined several other **kinds of training outsiders should have if they are to exercise decision-making authority** in the schools, including educational theory (how and why people learn), group process (how do groups function well?), facilities management and public relations. Also, "They need to know a lot about human relations, interactions...and they need some information about budget. How do you handle and manage money? Also, they need to know about organizational development because what we are really talking about is changing the way schools do business" (Interview, district partnership coordinator, p. 12).

When pressed however, the partnership coordinator noted that **few of the outsiders active in his district's schools get such experience**, despite district guidelines mandating minimal training for community members included in critical school decision-making. As a result, central administration often withholds the right of community members, such as those serving as members of site councils, to make certain kinds of decisions. "They also require that their decision-making powers be limited. You can't decide on personnel matters, and you can't decide on the budget. You can work on the curriculum, but you can't make the final curriculum decisions" (Interview, district partnership coordinator, p. 12).

Despite these guidelines, this partnership did help decide on personnel matters (the corporate representative even sat in on meetings to select the school principal), the **budget** (which partnership members provided almost completely) and **curriculum** decisions (veto over program curricular plans), sometimes to the discomfort of school insiders.

For example, as with the corporation, university representatives were concerned with initiating change in desired directions, particularly regarding use of educational technology (the focus of the federal grant which provided most of the university-supplied funds), and adoption of particular classroom practices (cooperative learning, encouragement of critical thinking skills, action research, reflective peer review). And, like the corporate representative, university representatives strategized to exercise influence in support of these institutional goals.

In journal notations and meeting notes I mention actively using my position as project coordinator to lobby individual teachers on the technology committee to vote their support for creation of a new position at the school, that of computer lab director/building technology staffer. (Meeting Notes, April 22 and journal entries, April 23 & 24). In my estimation, project technical goals could not be advanced in later years without this critical support position. However, the small amount of school money available for new staff meant that a bilingual aide position funded in the past was denied to make the new position possible. In short, the lobbying was a direct

intrusion into budget and personnel considerations justified on the basis that the newly-funded position was in the overall, long-term interest of the school. But I doubt that the short-handed bilingual teachers would agree, even though the technology committee decision was unanimous.

Why did this partnership have such **latitude? Probably largely because of the prestige and presumed expertise of the two main outside institutions**, the university and corporate partners. The school district, which had splashily announced the partnership in the media at its inception, was anxious to retain the support of these major partners for future endeavors. The importance of this to the district is dramatically indicated by the principal's annual evaluation sheet, which includes room for comments on her relationship to the partners.

> ...part of my evaluation, and part of my, you know, er, from my supervisor, part of my, um, evaluation each year is around...that a major element is the success of the partnership, particularly the corporate part. They just write it in– "Maintain a positive relationship with Company A." (Interview, principal, p. 27)

Also contributing was the district's pressing need for additional resources for some of its more beleaguered urban sites. As the school principal noted, "Face it. A school like ours needs a partner" (Interview, principal, p. 4). If schools lack sufficient resources from within their own system and are forced to turn outward for them, educators must consider the possibility that outsiders providing what is needed will want to determine how it is used, whether they have sufficient background to make those determinations well or not.

And finally, since the school district partnership representative ceased attending partnership meetings, he knew what was happening in the program only by the sketchy, informal reports given him by the principal. If partners exceeded their decision-making authority as outside community members, he could not know it. Moreover, by not being present at the primary setting in which information was exchanged and decisions made he lost the chance to either exercise his own authority or moderate that of others.

In short, in their eagerness to advance the good of the school and its students by garnering the consistent support of influential institutions with ample resources, the **two insiders who could have best used the authority of their positions to limit the range of partnership decisions made by outsiders largely chose not to exercise it.** This choice meant that for good or ill "the partners" had a great deal of influence over the program, including many aspects of it that traditionally would be considered the primary purview of professional K-12 educators.

As the district partnership coordinator suggested, the range of influence experienced in this partnership is not typical of most collaborations. However, **there are enough ambitious partnerships of large scale to warrant further research** into the nature of their work. For

example, many technology partnerships involve major hardware and software firms in extensive reworking of school structure, curriculum and classroom practice (such as the Apple Classrooms of Tomorrow projects). And even in smaller collaborations issues of optimal assignment of responsibility can arise.

Data from additional case studies would hopefully stir an educational policy debate about the appropriate overlap between community organizations and schools. Many restructuring or school change initiatives make reference to giving private and public community members increased "voices" in school decision-making, yet the mechanics of doing this are still largely experimental and there is no consensus, or even much discussion, on mediating insider/outsider relations. Educators should be careful that in their eagerness to collaborate they do not give away their authority. It should not be assumed that experienced, trained educators have no knowledge which is proprietary and no responsibilities which are unique.

Conclusion

In this partnership influence flowed like a stream from the primary decisionmakers or 'partners' (university/corporate/school district) through brokers or linkers to school staff and students (The idea of "influence streams" comes from Kingdon, 1984).

This influence stream had two dynamics– the more placid, deep 'pooling' of influence in formal meetings where all participants were gathered, characterized by polite exchanges of information, money and expertise; and the swifter, more turbulent, swirling, and ever-changing current of pairs and small groups where emotions ran quick, erupting more easily to the surface. In these currents authority, status, and power sometimes forcibly directed the flow.

In this partnership the stream flowed mostly downward. There was less current running the other way, as the school staff who were not active participants in the partnership had their influence funneled through a few channels (the linker/brokers) and an occasional pair or small group where they could be less constrained. It was largely not a two-way current.

This case study also indicates that the "power-influence" perspective on educational policymaking can be used to give interesting and productive insights into the internal politics of educational partnerships. The process of collaboration among people representing disparate institutions allied to accomplish a common goal is by nature political. It involves negotiation, brokering, compromise and mutual accomodation as well as conflict, dissension and power play. In short, it is a very human process in which people use the resources at their command to advance their personal, institutional and collective goals as best they can.

The "power-influence" perspective helps us understand how actors in a partnership interact, with whom, how often, with which resources, and with what results. In part it tells us why. It is one way of giving us a glimpse into the inner workings of an educational arrangement of increasing importance which has not yet been finely examined.

However, I would be doing the people involved in this collaboration with me a disservice if I did not also suggest that this particular political perspective, with its emphasis on power relations, when applied at this micro-level (a detailed case study of one small group), tends to cast the endeavor in a far less positive light than those involved in it would probably validate. As suggested by Bolman and Deal, the political frame "has two major limitations: (1) it underestimates the significance of rational and collaborative processes; and (2) it is normatively cynical and pessimistic, overstating the inevitability of conflict and underestimating potential for collaboration" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, pp. 237-238).

I believe that even a far more objective observer than I could state that overall this partnership did far more good for the program, its students and the school than bad, and that the participants generally felt enriched, rather than impoverished, by their experience with it. I know that is certainly the case with me. The exercise of influence in pursuit of a positive goal is not a bad thing, and we are after all, pioneering arrangements of this kind, making mistakes as we go. It is up to the education community as a whole to decide the value and limits of such collaborations as we have more experience of them.

Appendix A
Coding Scheme

Actors (A)
corporate representative (A/C)
university representative (A/U)
school district representative (A/SD)
school administrator (A/A)
school teacher (A/T)
school staff (A/S)
program director (A/D)
kids (A/K)
community members (A/Com)
consultants (A con)

Setting (S)
university setting (S/U)
    board room (S/Ub)
    offices (S/Uo)
corporate setting (S/C)
    board room (S/Cb)
    offices (S/Co)
school district setting (S/SD)
    board room (S/SDb)
    offices(S/SDo)
school setting (S/S)
    Teaching Academy Office (S/Sta)
    principal's office (S/Sp)
    computer lab(S/Scl)
    staff computer lab (S/Sscl)
    classroom (S/Sc)
    lunchroom (S/Sl)
    hallway (S/Sh)
informal settings (S/I)
    restaurants (S/Ir)
    professional events (S/Ipe)
    phone/mail (S/pm)
another school (S/O)
community setting (S/Com)

Resources (R)
funds/money (R/F)
    federal grant (R/Fg)
    institutional money (R/Fi)
people (R/P)
    trainers/teachers (R/Pt)
    mentors (R/Pm)
    tutors (R/Ptut)
    experts (R/Pex)
    coordinator (R/Pco)
    students (R/Ps)
information/expertise (R/I)
    research (R/Ir)
    technical expertise (R/It)
    Program Information (R/Ip)
    other expertise (R/Ioe)
authority (R/A)
status (R/S)
time(R/T)
numbers/cohesion (R/N)
equipment (R/Eq)
facilities (R/Fac)

Goals (G)
recruit (G/Rec)
    minority teachers (G/Rect)
    students (G/Reck)
create special program (G/sp)
    keep program going (G/pm)
promote new teaching (G/T)
    with technology (G/TTech)
    new pedagogy (G/Tped)
    new curriculum (G/Tcur)
keep high school open (G/Op)
    racial integration (G/Int)
increase college enrollment (G/Col)
personal/professional development (G/Pd)
create community (G/Com)
prompt organizational change (G/Org)
maintain partnership (G/Part)
support your group--advocacy (G/Adv)
get funding (G/Gm)
    grant money (G/Gmg)
    institutional money (G/Gim)

Points of Influence (P)
staffing (P/S)
curriculum (P/C)
professional development (P/D)
student activities (P/St)
classroom practice (P/C)
institutional procedures (P/P)
institutional goals (P/G)
scheduling (P/Sch)
student recruitment (P/Rec)
leadership style (P/L)
community relations (P/Cr)
program resources (P/Res)
ambiance (P/Amb)
organizational development (P/Od)
program development (P/Pd)

Strategies (St)
Control Access/communication (St/A)
    formal (meetings, testimony, established channels) (St/Af)
    informal (clubs, social groups, networks, phone calls, personal visits) (St/Ai)
Coalition formation (St/C)
    personal negotiation/compromise (St/Cn)
    brokering between groups (St/Cb)
Agenda-setting (St/Ag)
    formal (on written agendas) (St/Agf)
    informal (through interpersonal contacts) (St/Agi)
Control Scope of Conflict (St/Con)
    inside-privatize (St/Coni)
        establish procedures/routines (St/Conip)
        documentation (St/Conid)
        change personnel (St/Coniper)
    outside- publicize (St/Conop)
Symbol formation (St/Sy)
    picture (St/Syp)
    words (documentation/statements) (St/Syw)
Seek information (St/I)
    formal research (St/If)
    informal questioning (St/Ii)
Pressure (St/P)
    threats (exit, withdraw resources etc.) (St/Pth)
    charged emotions (anger, fear, crying etc.) (St/Pem+)
    positive emotions (happiness, community feeling) (St/Pem-)

References Cited

1. Allison, G. T. (1971). Essence of Decision:Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
2. Baker, L. (1994) Promoting Success in Educational Partnerships Involving Technology. In Ely, D., and Minor, B. eds., Educational Media and Technology Yearbook. (In Press).
3. Baldridge, J.V. (1971). Power and Conflict in the University: Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
4. Baldridge, J, & Deal, T.(1983) The Basics of Change in Educational Organizations. In Baldrige, J. & Deal, T. (eds.), The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
5. Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1991) Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
6. Campbell, R.F.; Cunningham, L.L.; Nystrand, R.O.; and Usdan, M.D. (1990). The Organization and Control of American Schools. Fifth Edition. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.
7. Campbell, R. F. ; & Mazzoni, T.L. (1976). State Policymaking for the Public Schools. Berkeley: McCutcheon.
8. Cates, C. (1986) Interorganizational Collaboration and School Improvement. Teacher Education Quarterly (Spring), 84-101.
9. Chion-Kennedy, L. (1989). America's Leaders Speak Out on Business-Education Partnerships. In Compact Institute/Business Leadership Forum, (pp. 41). Washington D.C.: National Alliance of Business.
10. Cobb, R.W. & Elder, C.D. (1983). Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Building. Second Edition. Cleveland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
11. Danzberger, J. P. (1990). Educational Partnerships Program: Analysis of Project Characteristics (Commissioned Report, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Programs for the Improvement of Practice.
12. Easton, D. (1965). A Framework for Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice- Hall.
13. Easton, D. (1965). A Systems Analysis of Political Life. New York: John Wiley &Sons, Inc.
14. Edelman, M. (1976) The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
15. Glesne, C.; & Peshkin, A. (1992) Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction. White Plains: Longman Publishing Company.
16. Grobe, T., et. al. (1990) Synthesis of Existing Knowledge and Practice in the Field of Educational Partnerships. Commissioned Report. Prepared for the Educational Partnerships Study Group, Office for Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., December.
17. Intriligator, B. (1986). Collaborating with the Schools: A Strategy for School Improvement. Paper presented at the 67th Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, April 16-20, San Francisco, Ca.
18. Kanter, R. M. (1973). Symbolic Interactionism and Politics in Systemic Perspective. In A. Efferat (Eds.), Perspectives in Political Sociology (pp. 77-92). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
19. King, A. (1986) Synthesis of Information Relating to School and Business Partnerships. Report prepared for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, Washington. D.C., February 28.
20. Kingdon, J. (1984) Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
21. Lasswell, H. (1936). Politics: Who gets what, when, how. New York: McGraw-Hill.

22. Malen, B. (1985). The Political Bargaining Model– "New" Dimensions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April.
23. Mann, D. (1987). Business Involvement and Public School Improvement, Part 1. Phi Delta Kappan, (October), 123-128.
24. Mann, D. (1987). Business Involvement and Public School Improvement: Part 2. Phi Delta Kappan, (November), 228-232.
25. Mazzoni, T. A (1982) Framework for Political (power) Analysis.
26. Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984) Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
27. Morgan, G. (1986). Images of Organization. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
28. Pawley, R. (1992). Multi-organizational collaborations: An illustration of Intriligator's model for evaluating educational partnerships. Masters thesis: University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
29. Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in Organizations. Marshfield: Pitman.
30. Rist, M. (1990). Angling for Influence. The American School Board Journal, 1990 (April), 20-25.
31. Rogers, E.; & Shoemaker, F. (1971) Communication of Innovations: A Cross-cultural Approach. 2nd Ed. New York: Free Press
32. Sirotnik, K. (1991). Making School-University Partnerships Work. Metropolitan Universities, 2(1), 15-24.
33. Weatherley, R. & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-Level Bureaucrats and Institutional Innovation: Implementing Special-Education Reform. Harvard Educational Review 47(2),171-197.
34. Wirt, F. ; & Kirst, M. (1972). The Political Web of American Schools. Boston: Little, Brown.
35. Wise, A. (1983). Why Educational Policies Often Fail: The Hyperrationalization Hypothesis. In Baldridge, J.V. & Deal, T. Eds., The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education. Berkley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
36. Yin, R.K. (1981). The Case Study as a Serious Research Strategy. Knowledge 3, 97-114.